

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-17, and 29 are pending. Claims 5 and 18-28 are currently canceled. Claims 1, 3, 6, and 15 are currently amended. Claim 29 has been added. Reconsideration of the application is requested.

§ 103 Rejections

Claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Merrill, *et al.*, US Patent 6,197,948 (“Merrill”) either alone, or further in view of Weber, *et al.*, US Patent 5,808,794 (“Weber”). Applicants respectfully disagree with the reasoning set forth in the Office Action. However, Applicants’ amendment of claim 1 renders the rejection moot. Applicants reserve the right to revisit prosecution of the previously entered claims at a later date without having acquiesced to the arguments forwarded in the Office Action dated 2/27/2007.

In particular, in the Office Action, it is stated that Merrill is “...the primary reference seen to disclose the basic claimed invention as already noted.” Applicants note that “basic claimed invention” is vague and indefinite. Applicants reiterate their stance, as previously discussed in arguments, that Merrill does not render their invention (as originally, previously, or currently claimed) obvious in view of any other reference or the knowledge possessed by an ordinary artisan.

In this response, Applicants have amended claim 1, removing the stipulation regarding gain, and newly reciting incorporating the first surface layer with at least an additional layer to form an optical film, the additional layer comprising a disperse phase disposed within a continuous phase. Applicants have also amended claim 1 to specify that the first film comprises a core layer, a term defined at the onset of the Detailed Description of the specification. Applicants submit that Merrill and all other art of record do not disclose a method of making an optical film including preparing a first surface layer as recited and incorporating the first surface layer into an optical film comprising an additional disperse/continuous phase layer.

Applicants were the first to recognize the benefits of coextruding a disperse/continuous phase layer along with a sacrificial core layer, removing the disperse/continuous phase layer from the sacrificial core layer, and then combining the disperse/continuous phase layer with at least one other such layer to form a more effective optical film. In Applicants’ Response of

7/20/2006, multiple arguments were made regarding differences between the disclosure of Merrill and the instant application. While in the Office Action of 9/25/2006 it was stated that these arguments were fully considered but not found persuasive, multiple arguments of Applicants were not directly addressed by the Patent Office. Applicants reiterate the arguments of 7/20/2006, and add the observation that the passage bridging columns 27 and 28 of Merrill speaks specifically to sacrificial outer layers, without suggestion of a sacrificial core layer.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 1, and claims 2-4, 6-17 and 29 that each add additional features to claim 1, are patentable over Merrill and Merrill in view of Weber. It is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Examination and reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested. Allowance of claims 1-4, 6-17 and 29, as amended, at an early date is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

29 May, 2007

Date

By: Robert J. Pechman

Robert J. Pechman, Reg. No.: 45,002

Telephone No.: 651-737-0631

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833